UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,918	09/29/2003	Robert Bruce Blair	TVW/APP49US	2089

59906 7590 09/21/2006

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
TVWORKS, LLC
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SUITE 100
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER	
HUYNH, THU V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,918	BLAIR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu V. Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9 and 11-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *12 and 13* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3, 4-9, 11-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 07/07/06 to application filed on 09/29/03, which has the benefit of prior provisional filed on 09/27/02.

2. Claim 1 is currently amended. Claims 2, 10 and 14 are currently canceled.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4-9, 11-13 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 4-9 and 11 are elected for examination.

4. Rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> (b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1, 3, 4-8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Macfarlane et al., US 2001/0042081 A1, filed 04/08/99 in view of Burkett et al., US 6,671,853 B1, filed 07/15/99 and Beranek et al., US 6,226,642 B1, filed 09/97.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Macfarlane teaches propagating presentation code to a client, said client using a constrained function presentation engine (Macfarlane, [0020], [0032], [0052]), said method comprising the steps of:

- identifying a style information within said presentation code (Macfarlane,[0020], [0022], [0023], [0032]; identifying a style information in HTML or XML markup language document to process paring); and
- resolving said style information to subset of style information adapted for use by said constrained function presentation engine (Macfarlane, [0055], [0093], removing style information that is not supported by the user device in the to provide a pared HTML or XML markup language document, and transmitting the pared HTML or XML markup language document to the user device transmission cost and transmission delay are reduced); and
- wherein said resolving said style information comprises one or more of reducing the number of style properties, deleting style rules and simplifying style dependencies in said style information (Macfarlane, [0032], [0093]; removing unused ones of style attributes, such as color or style of a font style).

However, Macfarlane does not explicitly disclose compressing said presentation code including resolved style information to provide a binary file, said resolved style information being within said binary file and adapted to enable client manipulate.

Burkett teaches compressing said presentation code including resolved style information to provide a binary file, said resolved style information being within said binary file and adapted to enable client manipulation; and propagating said binary file toward said client (Burkett, col.2,

lines 36-41; col.3, lines 1-9 and 24-35; col.7, lines 42-43 and col.8, lines 8-12; sever pre-parses XML document into DOM tree and this DOM tree is streamed into binary file so that information represented therein to be very quickly upon a subsequence access. The user is able to unstream or deserialize the binary file into DOM tree and the streamed file is transmitted from server to client).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Burkett's teaching and Macfarlane's teaching to stream the pared XML markup language document into a binary file, since the combination would have provided information quickly upon a subsequence access as Burkett's disclosed.

Beranek teaches resolving style information comprises deleting style rules or simplifying style dependencies (Beranek, fig.6; col.11, lines 25-32; col.12, line 62- col.13, line 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Beranek's teaching and Macfalane's teaching, since the combination would have remove/replace tag or tag attributes to pare the markup document in order to display appropriately in a small display device.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Macfarlane teaches said presentation code is substantially compliant with an HTML/CSS system (Macfarlane, [0022]; markup language is HTML).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Macfarlane teaches said presentation code comprises at least one of in-line XML styles and CSS style sheet (Macfarlane, [0023], [0032], [0105]; removing style attribute markup, wherein markup is XML).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Burkett teaches translating said binary file into a document tree containing a plurality of nodes, each of said nodes comprising at least one user manipulable property (Burkett, col.2, lines 13-52; col.3, lines 30-35 and 54-58; de-serializing the binary file into DOM tree for operation, such as modifying, changing, deleting or/and adding node(s)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Burkett's teaching and Macfarlane's teaching to de-serialize the binary file into DOM tree, since the combination would have allowed the user to manipulate elements in the DOM tree to modify information represented in the binary stream as Burkett disclosed in col.3, lines 54-58.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Burkett teaches validating said presentation code and resolved style information to enable non-validating parsing at said client (Burkett, col.3, lines 28-35; pre-parsing the XML markup language document).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Macfarlane teaches adapting the style resolving process in response to an indicium of capability of a client (Macfarlane, [0055], [0058], [0093]; client's application or device type).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Macfarlane teaches said indicium comprises a control signal received from the client (Macfarlane, [0057], [0097], [0098]; user application or device type is received from user request, when user logs on or inferred by the application).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, referring to the rationale relied to reject claim 1, the limitation of "compressing common resolved styles" is included, since tags have color attribute are removed (Burkett, col.3, lines 1-5) and are streamed into the binary file. The rationale is incorporated herein.

7. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Macfarlane in view of Burkett as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Hill et al., US 6,023,714, filed 04/97.**

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Macfarlane teach said presentation code comprises a markup file and style information (Macfarlane, [0021], [0032], [0093]). However, Macfarlane does not explicitly teach style information is CSS style sheets.

Hill teaches presentation code comprises a markup file and associated CSS style sheets (Hill, col.7, lines 2-35; CSS style sheet for an HTML document include style definition which define values for properties associated with HTML tags).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hill's teaching and Macfarlane's teaching to include

presentation code comprises CSS style sheets, since the combination would have provided different ways to format an HTML document as well as pared a markup language document that is style by HTML markup attributes and/or CSS style sheets for specific browsers or devices before transmitting to the user.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/07/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that "[n]either MacFarlane nor Burkett teach or suggest deleting style rules or simplifying style dependencies in the style information".

This is not persuasive. The combination of MacFarlane and Beranek teaches the claimed limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Parasnis et al., US 2001/0044809 A1, filed 12/00, teaches process of localizing objects in markup language documents.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
September 14, 2006

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER